DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 460 420 EA 027 772

TITLE	Accountability Manual, 1996: The 1996-2000 Accountability Rating System for Texas Public Schools and School Districts. Part 2: Comparable Improvement.
INSTITUTION	Texas Education Agency, Austin. Office of Policy Planning and Research.
PUB DATE	1996-05-00
NOTE	77p.; For Part 1, see EA 027 771.
AVAILABLE FROM	Texas Education Agency, 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701-1494 (publication no. GE6-602-02, $1). Tel: 512-463-9744. For full text: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/96/ci/contents html.
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; Attendance; Dropout Rate; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; Internet; *Performance; Public Schools; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

This manual is designed as a technical resource to explain the accountability system used by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to evaluate the performance of public school districts and campuses. The system integrates district accreditation status; campus ratings; district and campus recognition for high performance and performance improvement; and campus, district, and state-level reports. The manual, part 2, provides information on Comparable Improvement (CI), a statutorily required measure. Information in part 2 has no effect on how the 1996 accountability ratings are determined. The manual provides details on the calculation of CI, the information reported in the measure, and its future application in determining accountability ratings. Following the introduction, the second section explains campus CI comparison groups. Each campus has a unique comparison group of 40 other campuses that closely match the target school on a number of characteristics. The next two sections describe the student measures used in CI and special circumstances. Sections 5 through 7 explain how to use the 1996, 1997, and 1998-2000 CI's. Four tables are included. The appendix describes how to access CI on the Internet. (LMI)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 460 420

1996 Accountability Manual

The 1996 – 2000 Accountability Rating System for Texas Public Schools and School Districts

PART 2: COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT

EA 027 772

Texas Education Agency
Office of Policy Planning and Research
May 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Kemp
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

2

3

Additional copies of this publication can be obtained for $1.00 by contacting the Division of Publications Distribution of the Texas Education Agency at (512) 463-9744.

Material in this publication is not copyrighted and may be reproduced.

Table of Contents

Section I— Introduction 1

Background 1
Statutory Requirements 2
Development Process 2
Overview of CI Use in the Accountability System 3

Section II— Campus Comparable Improvement Comparison Groups .. 5

Overview 5
Building Campus Comparison Groups 5
Variables Used 5
Detailed Calculations 6
How Groups Are Constructed 6
Other Options Considered 7

Section III—Student Measures Used in Comparable Improvement 9

Outcomes Measured 9
Students to Be Included 9
Grades 4-8 9
Grade 10 9
Grade 3 10
Growth on the Texas Learning Index 10
Step 1: Student TLI Growth 10
Step 2: Campus Average TLI Growth 11
Step 3: Quartile Distribution of Growth 12

Table of Contents

Section IV— Special Circumstances 13
- Identifying Who Needs Special Treatment 13
- Small Numbers 13
- Pairing Campuses 13
  - Identifying Paired Campuses 13
  - Guidelines 14
  - What Information is Paired 14

Section V— Using 1996 Comparable Improvement 15
- Overview 15
- 1996 Campus AEIS Reports 15
  - Side 1: Demographic Characteristics Used to Determine the Groups 15
    - Sample 16
  - Side 2: TLI Growth Measures 17
    - Sample 18
- Principal Incentive Program 19

Section VI— Using 1997 Comparable Improvement 21
- Overview 21
- Campus Comparable Improvement 21
  - Potential Methodology Changes 21
  - Additional Acknowledgment 21
- District Comparable Improvement 22

Table of Contents

Section VII— Using Comparable Improvement in 1998 - 2000 23

Overview 23
1998 23
1999 - 2000 23
1998 - 2000 Accountability Ratings 23
TAAS Standards Review 24
Rating Impact 24
Summary 25
Exemplary 25
Recognized 25
Academically Unacceptable / Low-performing 27
Academically Acceptable / Acceptable 27
Interactions within the Accountability System 28
Relationship Between Required Improvement and Comparable Improvement 28
Why Use an All Students CI Measure to Raise / Lower Ratings 29
Calendar Issues 29
Examples of Ratings Impact 29

Section VIII— Appendix 33

Accessing Comparable Information on the Internet 33
Information Available 33
Internet Access 33
TENET Access 33
Questions 34

Acknowledgments

Executive Management

Mike Moses, Commissioner of Education

Felipe Alanis, Deputy Commissioner for Programs and Instruction

Project Leadership

Criss Cloudt, Associate Commissioner for Policy Planning and Research

Cherry Kugle, Senior Director, Division of Performance Reporting

Maureen Moore Scheevel, Planner, Office of Policy Planning and Research

Comparable Improvement Focus Group

Orbry Holden, *Educational Productivity Council, University of Texas*

John Stevens, Executive Director, *Texas Business and Education Coalition*

C. Neal Shaw, Director of Research, *Fort Worth ISD*

David Splitek, Associate Superintendent for Instructional Services, *San Antonio ISD*

Mike Strozeski, Director of Research, *Garland ISD*

William Webster, Research, Planning and Evaluation, *Dallas ISD*

TEA Staff Contributors

John Haetinger, Division of Performance Reporting

Diane Hernandez, Division of Performance Reporting

Shannon Housson, Division of Student Assessment

Cathy E. Long, Division of Performance Reporting

Betty Weed, Division of Performance Reporting

Section I— Introduction

The *Accountability Manual* is designed as a technical resource to explain the accountability system used by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to evaluate the performance of school districts and campuses. This system integrates district accreditation status; campus performance ratings; district and campus recognition for high performance and performance improvement; and campus, district, and state-level reports.

In 1996, TEA has published two accountability manuals: *Part 1* published in March to address the 1996 - 2000 accountability system criteria, standards, and implementation; and this document, *Part 2*, which provides information on Comparable Improvement, a statutorily required measure. **Information in *Part 2* will have no affect on how the 1996 accountability ratings are determined.** This document will, however, provide detail on the calculation of Comparable Improvement (CI), the information to be reported about the measure, and its future application in determining accountability ratings.

Background

Comparable Improvement has been a statutory component of the accountability system since its design in 1993, but implementation was postponed until the 1995-96 school year when student-level TAAS growth measures became available.

Although the *Texas Education Code* defines the structure of the Texas public school accountability system, it delegates the operational decisions of applying such a system to the commissioner of education. While Comparable Improvement is a statutory component of the accountability system, the specifics of its definition and its application to the system are not codified. Determining both the calculation method and application procedures of Comparable Improvement are the commissioner's responsibilities.

Statutory Requirements

In defining the Academic Excellence Indicators and their use, statute requires that performance improvement be reported and affect ratings determination. Two measures are defined: Required Improvement and Comparable Improvement. *Texas Education Code* §39.051(c) defines Comparable Improvement as:

> "measuring campuses and districts against a profile developed from a state total student performance data base which exhibits substantial equivalence to the characteristics of students served by the campus or district, including, but not limited to past performance, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and limited English proficiency [LEP]."

Statute requires that the measure be evaluated only for TAAS results and that it be determined for both districts and campuses; however, it is silent as to how it may affect accountability ratings. In contrast, both the definition and use of Required Improvement is specified by law. That measure has already been implemented in the accountability system and is addressed in the *1996 Accountability Manual, Part 1*.

Development Process

In the fall of 1995, the commissioner convened a focus group of school district, business, and community representatives to develop a recommendation for the definition and use of Comparable Improvement which meets statutory requirements. He gave them the following charges:

Charge 1	The committee will recommend how Comparable Improvement will be used in the accountability system. Should the measure affect the accountability ratings of districts and campuses? If so, which levels? If not, then what is its intended purpose?
Charge 2	The committee will recommend what performance will be compared. Depending on the recommendation under Charge 1, for which statutory indicators should the measure be calculated?
Charge 3	The committee will recommend a calculation methodology for Comparable Improvement.

Charge 4 The committee will recommend performance standards for Comparable Improvement.

Charge 5 The committee will propose an implementation schedule for its recommendations.

From September through March, the committee met 9 times and considered multiple options for meeting these charges. They explored models of varied mathematical complexity before reaching consensus. In March, the committee presented its findings to the commissioner; from their work, he has developed a proposal for educator review. This manual represents the commissioner's decisions after considering field and public comment on Comparable Improvement options.

Overview of CI Use in the Accountability System

Comparable Improvement in the public school accountability system:

- is computed for TAAS reading and mathematics only, for students who can be matched by their student identification numbers to their results from a prior school year.
- for campuses, is based on comparison groups of schools with similar characteristics.
- for districts, will be based on campus Comparable Improvement. A methodology for the district measure will be developed for 1997.
- In 1996:
  - Comparable Improvement is a "report-only" measure on campus AEIS reports.
  - Campus Comparable Improvement in reading will be one of the criteria for identifying principals rewarded in 1997 under the principal performance incentive program.
- In 1997:
  - Comparable Improvement will be reported on district and campus AEIS reports.
  - Comparable Improvement in reading will become a campus Additional Indicator in the accountability system. Those campuses demonstrating top performance on Comparable Improvement in reading will be formally acknowledged.

- In 1998 and beyond, Comparable Improvement will be used to affect district and campus accountability ratings as an addition to the current accountability system. Under specific conditions, districts and campuses initially rated:
  - *Recognized* can be lowered to *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable;*
  - *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* can be raised to *Recognized*; and
  - *Academically Unacceptable / Low-performing* can be raised to *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable.*

Section II— Campus Comparable Improvement Comparison Groups

Overview

The Comparable Improvement measure depends on campus comparison groups. Each campus will have a unique comparison group of 40 other campuses in the state that closely match the target school on a number of characteristics. These are different from the AEIS comparison groups reported in the past; those were considered too large and not sufficiently similar for use in Comparable Improvement. As with the past AEIS groups, Comparable Improvement groups will be recreated each year to account for changes in demographics which may occur. Comparable Improvement groups will be used for all group statistics reported on campus AEIS reports and the School Report Card.

Building Campus Comparison Groups

Variables Used

The characteristics used to construct the campus comparison groups include those defined in statute as well as others found to be statistically significant. These six campus-level characteristics are:

- percent of 1995-96 enrolled students identified as African American;
- percent of 1995-96 enrolled students identified as Hispanic;
- percent of 1995-96 enrolled students identified as White;
- percent of 1995-96 enrolled students identified as Economically Disadvantaged;
- percent of 1995-96 enrolled students identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP); and
- percent of mobile students as determined from 1994-95 cumulative attendance.

Detailed Calculations

The variables analyzed to construct the 1995-96 campus comparison groups are defined as follows. Calculations are rounded to one decimal place:

Variable	Calculation	Source
Percent African American	Number of African American Students Enrolled X 100 / Campus Enrollment	1995-96 PEIMS Submission 1
Percent Hispanic	Number of Hispanic Students Enrolled X 100 / Campus Enrollment	1995-96 PEIMS Submission 1
Percent White	Number of White Students Enrolled X 100 / Campus Enrollment	1995-96 PEIMS Submission 1
Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Enrolled X 100 / Campus Enrollment	1995-96 PEIMS Submission 1
Percent LEP	Number of Limited English Proficient Students Enrolled X 100 / Campus Enrollment	1995-96 PEIMS Submission 1
Percent Mobile	Students in Campus Membership less than 83% of Days Taught X 100 / Students in Campus Membership	1994-95 PEIMS Submission 3

NOTE: Only ADA eligible students are counted in enrollment or membership for these calculations.

How Groups Are Constructed

A unique comparison group of 40 campuses is identified for each school. The group is selected on the basis of the most dominant characteristics of the target campus. The order of dominance is determined by ranking the characteristics from highest to lowest percent. Only schools of similar type (elementary, middle, high school, or multi-level) form the selection pool.

Based on the most dominant characteristic for the target school from the six listed above, the 100 most similar campuses are selected. That group is further refined by the next most dominant feature, and so on, until 50 comparison campuses are identified. Finally, 10 campuses with the most dissimilar of the less predominant characteristics are eliminated to bring the group size to 40. Only the accountability student group characteristics — African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged — are used for this final reduction from 50 to 40 campuses; the percent LEP and percent mobile students are not considered when identifying the least predominant characteristics.

How Groups Are Constructed (cont.)

EXAMPLE:

Elementary Campus X: 19.8% Hispanic, 50.3% African American, 29.9% White, 40.4% Economically Disadvantaged, 12.0% LEP, 15.2% Mobile

Step 1: 100 elementary campuses having percentages closest to ***50.3% African American*** students are identified.

Step 2: 10 schools from the initial group of 100 are eliminated on the basis of being most distant from the value of ***40.4% Economically Disadvantaged***.

Step 3: 10 of the remaining 90 schools which are most distant from ***29.9% White*** students are eliminated.

Step 4: 10 of the remaining 80 schools which are most distant from ***19.8% Hispanic*** students are eliminated.

Step 5: 10 of the remaining 70 schools which are most distant from ***15.2% Mobile*** students are eliminated.

Step 6: 10 of the remaining 60 schools which are most distant from ***12.0% LEP*** students are eliminated.

Step 7: 10 of the remaining 50 schools which are most distant from 29.9% White students and / or 19.8% Hispanic students are eliminated.

The final group size is 40 schools.

There is no limit to the number of comparison groups to which a school may be a member. It is theoretically possible for a school to be a member of no comparison groups, or all of them.

Other Options Considered

A number of alternatives, including multi-linear regression and hierarchical linear modeling, were considered before this methodology was established. Once the decision was made to purse the predominant characteristics grouping methodology, a number of options for constructing the groups were analyzed before the strategy described was selected. Hypothetical schools created by statistical modeling were considered, but the advantage of evaluating the efforts of actual operating educational entities outweighed the precision achieved using more complex statistical strategies.

Section III— Student Measures Used in Comparable Iprovement

Outcomes Measured

According to statute, Comparable Improvement must be calculated for assessment results only, specifically those for the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) tests. Comparable Improvement measures will be based on analysis of growth on the Texas Learning Index (TLI), derived from the TAAS reading and mathematics tests only, given at grades 3 through 8, and 10.

Students to Be Included

Growth measures based on the TLI in reading and mathematics will be determined for those students who took the test(s) in the current and prior years. The methodology for identifying matched students in 1996 is detailed below. The matching is not limited by the grade level of the student in the prior year; retained as well as promoted students can be part of the set of matched students.

Grades 4-8

Students tested in the spring 1996 TAAS administrations on reading and / or mathematics who:

- are in grades 4, 5, 6, 7 or 8;
- are part of the 1996 accountability subset (non-special education students enrolled in the district as of October 27, 1995); and
- can be matched back to the spring 1995 TAAS administration in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, all students not in special education, anywhere in the state.

Grade 10

Students tested in the spring 1996 TAAS administrations on reading and /or mathematics who:

- are in grade 10;
- are part of the 1996 accountability subset; and
- can be matched back to the spring 1994 grade 8 TAAS administration, all students not in special education, anywhere in the state.

Grade 3

Students tested in the spring 1996 TAAS administrations on reading and mathematics in grade 3 cannot contribute to 1996 Comparable Improvement.

NOTE: Campuses without TAAS results at grades 4-8 or 10, and campuses which have TAAS results for only grade 3 are paired in order to calculate Comparable Improvement. The exception is campuses serving grades pre-kindergarten and / or kindergarten only; those schools are not required to be rated in the accountability system. (Refer to *Section IV, Special Circumstances* for details on pairing.)

Growth on the Texas Learning Index

Comparable Improvement measures are based on analysis of growth on the TLI for all matched students in reading and mathematics. The measures take several steps to compute; They begin with student-level calculations which are then aggregated to the campus level, and those results finally are analyzed within the comparison group.

Step 1: Student TLI Growth

Matched students for reading and matched students for mathematics will be separately identified. For each matched student, the TLI growth calculation is illustrated below:

(Raw) TLI Growth (Reading) = Current year Reading TLI - Prior Year Reading TLI

(Raw) TLI Growth (Mathematics) = Current year Mathematics TLI - Prior Year Mathematics TLI

A raw TLI growth of zero means that one year's growth has occurred. A negative value means that less than one year's growth has occurred and a positive value means that more than one year's growth has occurred. Examples of the reading calculation for two sixth grade students are provided:

EXAMPLE: JILL

(65)	—	(55)	=	(+10)
Jill's performance in Spring 1996		Jill's performance in Spring 1995		TLI Growth

Although Jill did not pass reading either year (a score of 70 is passing), she did show a positive growth from one year to the next.

EXAMPLE: JACK

(75)	—	(80)	=	(-5)
Jack's performance in Spring 1996		Jack's performance in Spring 1995		TLI Growth

Jack, on the other hand, passed both years, but he showed negative growth.

Step 1: Student TLI Growth (cont.)

A concern has been expressed that a growth value of zero does not adequately convey the concept of one year's growth. The Texas Education Agency is currently investigating whether alternative representations are psychometrically sound. If another representation is accepted, the interpretation will be provided with the 1996 AEIS reports.

Adjustments. The Texas Learning Index upon which Comparable Improvement is based is least sensitive to exceptionally high or low performance. This is a direct consequence of the criterion-referenced design of the TAAS program. Therefore, growth measures when overall performance is exceptionally high or low are likely not very reliable indicators of either performance problems or improvement.

Because of this and the fact that the maximum and minimum TLI scores can change from year to year and test to test, the raw TLI growth will be adjusted when the scores are very high or very low. In those cases, the value will not be permitted to show an increase or decline. As an example, if the highest possible TLI for 3rd grade reading was 94 and the next year, the highest score for fourth grade reading was 92, then a straightforward calculation would show a decline even though the student performed perfectly on both tests. For this reason, TLI growth will be adjusted for some students. For the majority of students however, the adjustments will not be necessary and the adjusted growth value will equal the raw growth value. In the examples with Jack and Jill, neither calculation would have to be adjusted.

The Texas Education Agency is currently pursuing the appropriate TLI values at which to apply these adjustments with psychometricians and educator representatives. Details about the transformations will be provided with the AEIS reports in the fall.

Step 2: Campus Average TLI Growth

For each subject, the adjusted student TLI growth values are aggregated to the campus level to create a TLI Average Growth (TAG) for each campus. The calculations, rounded to two decimal places, are illustrated below:

$$\text{TAG (Reading)} = \frac{\text{Sum of Matched Student TLI Growth Values (Adjusted) for Reading}}{\text{Total Number of Matched Students in Reading}}$$

$$\text{TAG (Mathematics)} = \frac{\text{Sum of Matched Student TLI Growth Values (Adjusted) for Mathematics}}{\text{Total Number of Matched Students in Mathematics}}$$

Step 3: Quartile Distribution of Growth

Within the comparison group, the quartile distribution of TAGs is determined and each campus is assigned one of the following separately for reading and for mathematics:

Q1 (top 25 percent);

Q2 (in the top 50 percent, but not in the top 25 percent);

Q3 (in the bottom 50 percent, but not in the lowest 25 percent);

Q4 (lowest 25 percent).

TAG values are ranked within the group to determine the quartile. Since campuses have a comparison group of 40 schools, 10 will comprise each quartile. For each subject, those in Q1 are the 10 schools with the highest TAG; those in Q4 are the 10 schools with the lowest TAG. (It is possible that the number of schools in each quartile would differ if TAG values are tied near the quartile separation points, or if some schools do not meet small numbers criteria.)

Each school is assigned two quartile values, one for reading and one for mathematics, depending on where the TAG would fall in the distribution of its unique set of 40 comparison schools. These are the Comparable Improvement measures for the target campus.

Section IV— Special Circumstances

Identifying Who Needs Special Treatment

Campuses may require special treatment if one of the following circumstances applies:

- the number of matched students tested is small; or
- the campus has no matched TAAS results.

Small Numbers

No size minimums are applied when calculating TLI average growth; however, a minimum is checked before the TAG is used in the accountability system in 1997 and beyond. Any campus with fewer matched students than the minimum will not have Comparable Improvement evaluated in order to determine whether Additional Acknowledgment is warranted or whether a rating should be changed. The minimum is now set at 10 matched students; however, that number may be raised before it is implemented in the 1997 system. 1996 Comparable Improvement values will be analyzed to make this determination.

Pairing Campuses

Identifying Paired Campuses

Schools which serve only grades for which no student matching is possible must be paired in order to calculate Comparable Improvement. Many of these schools have already been identified and paired by the district for determining accountability ratings. However, matching back to a prior year creates an additional set of schools needing a paired partner. In most cases, these will be schools who highest grade served is grade 3.

Guidelines

The following guidelines for pairing campuses apply:

- Campus pairings already identified for accountability ratings will be used for Comparable Improvement as well.
- For 1996, districts will be contacted by letter to identify any additional pairing relationships needed for Comparable Improvement. For 1997 and beyond, these relationships will be identified through the annual pairing request.
- Districts will make the decisions regarding pairing and will inform the state.
- Schools which are paired must have a "feeder" relationship and the grades should be contiguous. For example, a K-3 school should be paired with the 4-5 school which accepts its students into 4th grade.
- Districts may change pairings from year to year; however, these changes should be based on reasonable justification (e.g. change in attendance zones affecting feeder patterns).

What Information is Paired

TAG values, not quartile values, from the campus with matched students are shared with the campus without them. Each school has a unique comparison group so the quartile distribution for each is separately determined. Therefore, it is possible that the quartile values for each school in the pairing may differ even though the TAG values are identical. AEIS reports will note when a school has paired.

Section V— Using 1996 Comparable Improvement

Overview

In 1996, campus Comparable Improvement is used in two ways:

- CI is piloted on campus AEIS reports; and
- CI in reading will be used as a criterion to identify principals rewarded in 1997 under the Principal Incentive Program.

1996 Campus AEIS Reports

A Comparable Improvement report will be included with each campus Academic Excellence Indicator System report in the fall of 1996. This report includes two pages of information: the demographic characteristics used to determine the comparison groups, and the TLI growth measures. Samples of these reports are included for illustration on pages 16 and 18.

Side 1: Demographic Characteristics Used to Determine the Groups

For the target campus and each campus in the comparison group, the following information is provided on this part of the report:

① Campus Identification Number

② Campus Name

③ District Name

④ Target Campus, identified by an asterisk

⑤ Campus Type Code: Elementary, Middle, Secondary, or Multi-level;

⑥ Percent of 1995-96 Enrolled Students Identified as African American;

⑦ Percent of 1995-96 Enrolled Students Identified as Hispanic;



COMPARABLE IMPROVEMENT CAMPUS GROUPS - BASED ON 1995-96 DATA
TARGET CAMPUS = 999999999 SAMPLE EL
CAMPUS TYPE = ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

CAMPUS NUMBER	CAMPUS NAME	DISTRICT NAME	% AFR_AMER	% _WHITE__	% HISPANIC	% __ECON__	% MOBILITY	% __LEP___
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	42.0	48.7	7.8	64.3	23.4	0.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	36.5	52.1	10.3	52.3	26.0	0.4
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	42.0	39.6	14.4	64.4	26.4	2.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	40.7	40.0	14.3	53.2	28.9	4.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	40.1	44.8	11.7	68.4	28.4	1.3
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	38.6	38.5	14.7	36.6	29.9	3.8
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	42.5	34.8	21.7	59.1	15.9	0.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	36.4	49.1	12.4	40.8	13.5	0.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	42.6	48.1	9.3	64.1	14.2	7.3
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	36.3	47.5	14.6	25.5	11.8	0.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	43.7	32.8	21.3	44.4	12.1	5.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	35.3	51.0	12.2	38.2	25.7	3.7
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	43.3	41.3	11.9	31.4	19.3	3.6
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	35.4	45.9	11.5	39.4	27.2	1.5
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	42.6	40.8	14.7	48.0	26.0	1.9
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	40.1	38.7	20.5	63.6	25.4	2.3
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	38.9	24.2	19.6	48.7	23.2	15.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	40.6	23.2	17.0	41.8	22.5	17.5
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	37.9	42.8	18.3	45.4	15.1	0.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	41.6	31.1	19.2	37.5	17.5	10.8
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	35.4	43.3	17.2	28.4	11.2	5.7
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	39.4	37.0	17.0	44.5	12.4	14.9
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	43.7	20.0	33.8	50.6	21.2	21.6
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	39.6	32.1	22.2	40.0	29.2	8.9
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	37.1	56.8	5.8	61.6	12.6	2.8
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	35.8	46.8	10.5	56.1	12.8	0.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	37.0	49.5	9.0	50.3	29.1	8.6
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	37.7	49.8	11.1	60.8	17.0	4.1
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	37.7	48.7	12.3	55.5	10.4	1.9
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	38.2	47.7	13.0	62.9	12.6	7.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	43.2	29.6	27.4	68.1	22.3	2.9
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	40.8	33.6	25.2	56.1	11.6	0.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	43.6	47.4	7.8	61.3	21.4	0.7
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	40.5	51.4	7.8	43.1	22.6	0.3
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	43.9	46.3	8.7	56.9	21.1	0.4
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	39.7	37.7	22.6	14.1	1.9	0.0
999999999 *	SAMPLE EL	SAMPLE ISD	39.6	33.3	26.3	63.4	21.0	7.3
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	35.6	58.9	5.4	56.5	15.0	3.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	38.9	53.6	6.2	49.5	15.3	0.0
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	42.1	31.8	26.1	63.1	13.9	13.4
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	41.0	47.6	10.4	56.8	11.9	3.3

*** ORDER OF COLUMNS WILL VARY BETWEEN LISTS ***

⑧ Percent of 1995-96 Enrolled Students Identified as White;

⑨ Percent of 1995-96 Enrolled Students Identified as Economically Disadvantaged;

⑩ Percent of 1995-96 Enrolled Students Identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP); and

⑪ Percent of Mobile Students as Determined from 1994-95 Cumulative Attendance.

Side 2: TLI Growth Measures

For the target campus and each campus in the comparison group, the following information is provided on this part of the report:

① Identification Number

② Campus Name

③ Target Campus, identified with an asterisk

④ Number of Matched Students in Reading

⑤ 1996 Campus TLI Average in Reading

⑥ 1995 Campus TLI Average in Reading

⑦ TLI Campus Average Growth (TAG) in Reading

⑧ Quartile Position within the Comparison Group for TLI Growth in Reading

⑨ Number of Matched Students in Mathematics

⑩ 1996 Campus TLI Average in Mathematics

⑪ 1995 Campus TLI Average in Mathematics

⑫ TLI Campus Average Growth (TAG) in Mathematics

⑬ Quartile Position within the Comparison Group for TLI Growth in Mathematics



TARGET CAMPUS = 999999999 SAMPLE EL

CAMPUS NUMBER	CAMPUS NAME	READING NUMBER MATCHED STUDENTS	READING 1996 AVG TLI	READING 1995 AVG TLI	READING TLI AVG GROWTH	READING QUARTILE	MATH NUMBER MATCHED STUDENTS	MATH 1996 AVG TLI	MATH 1995 AVG TLI	MATH TLI AVG GROWTH	MATH QUARTILE
[illegible]	[illegible]	461	76.2	73.9	2.37	Q2	458	73.2	63.7	9.47	Q1
[illegible]	[illegible]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[illegible]	[illegible]	130	81.7	82.2	-0.50	Q4	132	76.7	70.8	5.94	Q2
[illegible]	[illegible]	157	83.6	81.4	2.15	Q2	155	76.9	70.3	6.61	Q2
[illegible]	[illegible]	174	82.2	80.7	1.53	Q2	179	76.9	69.5	7.33	Q1
[illegible]	[illegible]	172	82.9	78.5	4.35	Q1	168	79.3	70.7	8.60	Q1
[illegible]	[illegible]	304	84.2	79.5	4.69	Q1	307	78.0	70.6	7.41	Q1
[illegible]	[illegible]	304	84.2	79.5	4.69	Q1	306	78.0	70.6	7.41	Q1
[illegible]	[illegible]	112	73.8	71.1	2.63	Q1	110	64.7	60.7	4.03	Q3
[illegible]	[illegible]	83	83.8	82.7	1.16	Q3	83	80.7	75.9	4.80	Q3
[illegible]	[illegible]	210	78.3	77.2	1.11	Q3	220	68.1	68.2	-0.04	Q4
[illegible]	[illegible]	55	82.5	81.7	0.80	Q3	54	78.9	72.2	6.64	Q2
[illegible]	[illegible]	98	79.5	80.3	-0.81	Q4	97	75.7	73.7	1.95	Q4
[illegible]	[illegible]	151	84.0	82.9	1.15	Q3	153	78.5	72.3	6.15	Q2
[illegible]	[illegible]	51	75.6	75.0	0.61	Q3	51	74.2	62.4	11.76	Q1
[illegible]	[illegible]	131	74.6	70.1	4.49	Q1	137	64.3	57.3	6.95	Q1
[illegible]	[illegible]	125	78.2	76.5	1.71	Q2	121	73.7	72.8	0.91	Q4
[illegible]	[illegible]	166	83.0	81.8	1.17	Q3	165	78.1	72.6	5.52	Q2
[illegible]	[illegible]	199	79.4	76.9	2.55	Q2	202	72.3	67.5	4.88	Q2
[illegible]	[illegible]	137	79.9	79.9	0.03	Q4	138	74.3	71.7	2.61	Q3
[illegible]	[illegible]	210	84.5	83.1	1.40	Q3	205	78.4	75.4	3.04	Q3
[illegible]	[illegible]	110	83.5	80.5	2.99	Q1	104	78.3	74.6	3.71	Q3
[illegible]	[illegible]	99	81.3	83.1	-1.84	Q4	98	73.7	73.3	0.35	Q4
[illegible]	[illegible]	183	75.9	75.5	0.38	Q4	185	72.0	68.4	3.59	Q3
[illegible]	[illegible]	390	78.5	78.1	0.35	Q4	392	76.9	72.3	4.59	Q3
[illegible]	[illegible]	150	82.5	80.2	2.29	Q2	152	77.1	71.1	6.04	Q2
[illegible]	[illegible]	140	78.0	79.6	-1.63	Q4	138	73.6	73.1	0.46	Q4
[illegible]	[illegible]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[illegible]	[illegible]	211	79.8	79.2	0.54	Q4	211	73.6	72.1	1.42	Q4
[illegible]	[illegible]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
[illegible]	[illegible]	58	73.2	70.8	2.38	Q2	59	67.6	62.4	5.24	Q2
[illegible]	[illegible]	65	76.3	75.4	0.92	Q3	64	68.0	61.3	6.69	Q1
[illegible]	[illegible]	74	77.6	76.5	1.03	Q3	75	71.7	72.4	-0.72	Q4
[illegible]	[illegible]	87	80.5	78.6	1.83	Q2	85	74.9	67.9	6.97	Q1
[illegible]	[illegible]	147	78.0	77.9	0.02	Q4	148	74.7	73.6	1.09	Q4
999999999 *	SAMPLE EL	108	84.2	80.2	4.00	Q1	107	75.8	69.9	5.84	Q2
[illegible]	[illegible]	116	83.6	80.0	3.61	Q1	111	75.4	71.4	4.02	Q3
[illegible]	[illegible]	66	83.5	80.2	3.33	Q1	62	78.4	71.8	6.62	Q2
[illegible]	[illegible]	65	82.1	79.2	2.91	Q1	70	77.2	73.7	3.55	Q3
[illegible]	[illegible]	72	70.8	68.6	2.18	Q2	77	65.3	63.3	2.04	Q4
[illegible]	[illegible]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Past AEIS performance and profile report sections presented information for the campus, the district, the state, and the median of a 100-member campus comparison group. In 1996, the campus comparison groups for these report sections will be the same 40-member group used for the Comparable Improvement section of the report.

Principal Incentive Program

In Senate Bill 1, the 74th Legislature created a system to financially reward principals for both high gains and high levels of performance [*Texas Education Code* §21.357]. (The statute text is provided in *1996 Accountability Manual, Part 1.*) The criteria for the rewards must be designed by the commissioner of education using the advice from seven exemplary principals selected by the governor. Campus performance must be analyzed by quartile and a maximum of $5,000 can be paid to a principal ranked in the top quartile and a maximum of $2,500 can be paid to a principal ranked in the second quartile. A total of $5 million for the principal incentive program was appropriated for the 1996-97 fiscal year.

To complement the public school statewide reading initiative supported by Governor George W. Bush, the commissioner plans to use 1996 TLI Growth in reading as one of the criteria to identify principals receiving an award. The advisory committee of principals named by the governor in April 1996 will recommend specific criteria and standards for how recipients will be identified. Final decisions about the award criteria will be made by the commissioner.

Whether TLI Growth in future years will be used for this reward program cannot be determined at this time; the 75th Texas Legislature convening in January 1997 must appropriate funds for the principal incentive program to continue.

Section VI— Using 1997 Comparable Improvement

Overview

In 1997, Comparable Improvement will be used in two ways:

- A district Comparable Improvement measure will be piloted and CI will be reported on district and campus AEIS reports; and
- CI in reading will become an Additional Indicator for campuses.

Campus Comparable Improvement

Potential Methodology Changes

It is possible that the methodology for determining campus Comparable Improvement could be refined for 1997 based on the 1996 experience and field comment. Between May and December 1996, the commissioner will continue to accept and evaluate field input developed after the *Manual* is published and 1996 Comparable Improvement Reports in AEIS are received by school districts. Comments received in this time frame will not impact the 1996 Comparable Improvement Report, but can potentially affect Comparable Improvement calculations and application for future years. 1996 has been designated a pilot year for Comparable Improvement specifically for this purpose.

Additional Acknowledgment

As an additional support to the statewide reading initiative, schools may receive additional acknowledgment for Comparable Improvement in reading in 1997. Criteria for the acknowledgment will be developed and published in the *1997 Accountability Manual* published next spring. All types of schools will be eligible — elementary schools, middle schools, high schools, and multi-level schools.

The acknowledgment will be based on 1997 Comparable Improvement. Because Comparable Improvement cannot be determined before complete statewide results on TAAS are available, TEA will notify districts of the acknowledgment as part of the 1997 AEIS reports in October.

District Comparable Improvement

Although Comparable Improvement for districts based on district comparison groups was initially proposed, field response to the groups proposed in April was mixed. Development of a district measure derived from campus Comparable Improvement performance was identified as a more viable strategy. Although campus-derived measures had been explored in 1996, none were developed in sufficient detail for the advisory committee to recommend to the commissioner. Prior to the publication of the *1997 Accountability Manual* next spring, additional research will be conducted and a proposal distributed for field review.

Section VII— Using Comparable Improvement in 1998 - 2000

Overview

1998

In 1998, Comparable Improvement will be fully implemented. The accountability system will:

- report Comparable Improvement on district and campus AEIS reports; and
- Comparable Improvement to:
  - raise accountability ratings under specific circumstances; and
  - warn districts or campuses that a *Recognized* rating could be lowered the following year under specific circumstances.

1999 - 2000

In 1999 and beyond, the accountability system will:

- report Comparable Improvement on district and campus AEIS reports; and
- use Comparable Improvement to:
  - raise and lower accountability ratings under specific circumstances; and
  - warn districts or campuses that a *Recognized* rating could be lowered the following year under specific circumstances.

Decisions about the use of Comparable Improvement beyond 1997 as an Additional Indicator and as a criterion for state-funded award programs will be made at a later date.

1998 - 2000 Accountability Ratings

Through the year 2000, TAAS performance standards to earn the *Recognized* and *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* ratings are being raised. (See *1996 Accountability Manual, Part 1.*) Because of this, there are already high expectations for performance growth for the lowest-performing schools and districts. Without significant and sustained effort from Texas schools, the number failing to meet the minimally acceptable standards of performance will increase.

In 1998 and beyond, Comparable Improvement may affect the accountability rating of a district or school. The measure will be evaluated after a preliminary rating has been assigned based on comparisons of performance to absolute standards for the base indicators. With the implementation of Comparable Improvement, the accountability system has been designed to both recognize high performance growth by creating opportunities for raising ratings, and to lower the ratings of districts and schools with a sustained pattern of declining performance growth compared to similar schools.

TAAS Standards Review

The minimum TAAS passing standards for each rating are provided below. (See *1996 Accountability Manual, Part 1* for details.) The standard applies to all students and each student group (African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged).

Rating	1998	1999
Exemplary	90.0%	90.0%
Recognized	80.0%	80.0%
Academically Acceptable / Acceptable	40.0%	45.0%
Academically Unacceptable / Low-performing	less than 40.0%	less than 45.0%

Rating Impact

Although Comparable Improvement measures, *i.e.*, the quartile distributions of TAG results, can be determined and reported for every campus and district, they will be used only for lifting *Low-performing* schools / *Academically Unacceptable* districts into the *Acceptable / Academically Acceptable* category, and impacting the *Recognized* rating under specific conditions. Comparable Improvement will be applied in addition to Required Improvement and only an "all students" measure will be evaluated. (See *1996 Accountability Manual, Part 1* for information on Required Improvement.)

Summary

Accountability ratings can be raised or lowered by Comparable Improvement only under very specific conditions. Those are itemized in Table 1:

Table 1 — Summary of Comparable Improvement

Rating Change	Quartile Standard	TLI Growth Standard
Raised from *Academically Unacceptable / Low-performing* to *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* when the deficiency is in mathematics or reading	Math: top half (Q1 or Q2) Reading: top quartile (Q1)	must be positive
Raised from *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* to *Recognized* when TAAS reading / mathematics passing percent is within 5 percent of the *Recognized* standard	top quartile (Q1)	must be positive
Lowered from *Recognized* to *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* in 2nd year; in 1st year a warning is issued	bottom quartile (Q4) in same subject - 2 consecutive years	must be negative both years

NOTE: A district or school rating could not be lowered from *Recognized* until 1999.

The measure's impact on each rating category is described in detail below. Tables 3 and 4 on pages 31-32 illustrate the specific application of Comparable Improvement in 1998 and 1999.

Exemplary

Comparable Improvement performance will not affect the rating of any district or school meeting *Exemplary* performance standards; however, quartile performance on Comparable Improvement for these schools and districts will be reported on AEIS.

Recognized

For a district or school to earn the *Recognized* rating, it must meet additional performance requirements after performance against the base indicator standards are evaluated. These are described according to the initial evaluation against base indicator standards.

Meets Recognized *Base Indicator Standards*

If the TAAS passing rate for all subjects, all students, and all student groups is at least ***80.0 percent*** passing, then Required Improvement will not be evaluated. However, Comparable Improvement will be evaluated as follows:

Recognized

- **Rating Lowered to *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable*.** The accountability rating assigned in the second year of declining performance will be *Academically Acceptable /Acceptable* instead of *Recognized*, even though the higher rating's base indicator standards were met. For a rating to be lowered, a school or district must have:
  - had both a declining TLI growth value and a Q4 Comparable Improvement value in the same subject (reading or mathematics), for two consecutive years; and
  - received a *Recognized* rating with a warning the previous year.

  The first lowered ratings could occur in 1999.

- **Maintains *Recognized* Rating.** If Comparable Improvement criteria for a lowered rating is <u>not</u> met then the rating remains *Recognized*. If Comparable Improvement is in Q4 and TLI growth for either reading or mathematics is negative for the current year, but not the prior year, a warning will be issued. Warnings would first be issued in 1998.

Within 5 Percent of Recognized *Base Indicator Standards*

If the TAAS passing rate for any subject, all students, or any student groups is between ***75.0 - 79.9 percent*** passing, the school will be rated *Recognized* if:

- it meets the *Recognized* standards for the attendance rate, TAAS writing, and the dropout rate, if appropriate; and
- for those subjects / groups between 75.0 - 79.9 percent passing,
  - Required Improvement to the *Recognized* standard is met (Reading, Writing, or Mathematics); OR
  - if the deficient subject is reading or mathematics, TLI growth for that subject is in the top quartile (Q1) of the comparison group, and is positive.

Without this opportunity, a district or school that meets these standards would be rated *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable*.

Academically Unacceptable / Low-performing

A district or school initially rated *Academically Unacceptable / Low-performing* because of TAAS reading or mathematics (but not writing or the dropout rate) can use Comparable Improvement as an additional mechanism to earn the *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* rating if the following conditions are true:

- The district or school meets the *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* standards or has demonstrated Required Improvement for any other appropriate base indicators, *i.e.*, attendance, dropouts, TAAS writing; and
- The district's or school's quartile value in the deficient subject meets the Comparable Improvement standard.
  - If the deficient subject is mathematics, TLI growth is in the top half (Q1 or Q2) of the comparison group distribution and is positive; or
  - If the deficient subject is reading, TLI growth is in the top quartile (Q1) of the comparison group distribution and is positive. The differential standards were set to emphasize the critical role of reading in academic success.

A district or school which was initially rated *Academically Unacceptable / Low-performing* because of TAAS writing or the dropout rate can earn the *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* rating only if it meets Required Improvement for all deficiencies in writing and the dropout rate.

Academically Acceptable / Acceptable

Comparable Improvement will not affect the accountability ratings of the majority of districts and schools who receive a rating of *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable*. Only those districts and schools which were lowered from *Recognized* or those who were raised from *Academically Unacceptable / Low-performing* due to Comparable Improvement are affected by the measure.

Interactions within the Accountability System

RI / CI Relationship

Comparable Improvement is not a replacement for Required Improvement; but in some cases it can be used in a similar manner to Required Improvement to change an accountability rating.

Required Improvement for TAAS reading, mathematics, and writing, and the dropout rate will continue to be defined as sufficient progress to meet the standard within five years. It can be used to raise a rating from *Academically Unacceptable / Low-performing* to *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* or from *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* to *Recognized*. It can be evaluated for any TAAS subject area, all students, or any student group. In 1998 and beyond, Required Improvement's role with respect to the *Recognized* rating has been changed from being an additional hurdle to maintain the rating to becoming a gate up from *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable*.

Comparable Improvement for reading and mathematics can also affect the *Recognized* and *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* rating categories. In circumstances where a rating would be raised, either Required Improvement or Comparable Improvement may be used to meet the improvement requirements. The interactions between the improvement measures are detailed in Table 2.

Table 2 — Interaction Between Required Improvement and Comparable Improvement

Rating Impact	TAAS Subject	Required Improvement		Comparable Improvement	
				Quartile Standard	TLI Growth
Raised from *Academically Unacceptable / Low-performing* to *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable*	Reading Mathematics Writing	met for all deficient areas / student groups	OR	top quartile (Q1) top half (Q1 or Q2)	must be positive
Raised from *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* to *Recognized* when TAAS passing percent is within 5 percent of the *Recognized* standard	Reading Mathematics Writing	met for all subjects / student groups between 75.0%-79.9%	OR	top quartile (Q1)	must be positive
Meets all *Recognized* base indicator standards	Reading and Mathematics			NOT bottom quartile (Q4) in same subject for 2 consecutive yrs	NOT negative in same subject for 2 consecutive yrs
Lowered from *Recognized* to *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable* in 2nd year; in 1st year a warning is issued	Reading and Mathematics			bottom quartile (Q4) in same subject - 2 consecutive years	negative in same subject both years

Why Use an All Students CI Measure

Why an All Students Measure Is Being Used to Raise / Lower Ratings? Comparable Improvement has been designed to account for demographic variation in campus and district composition. The composition of the individual student groups (African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged) used to evaluate absolute performance directly affects the identification of comparison groups. Therefore, student groups are a component of the all students Comparable Improvement measure. Additionally, although student group growth could be calculated, analysis has shown many districts and schools would not have sufficient matched students in the groups to calculate the measure.

Calendar Issues

Because Comparable Improvement is based on current year, statewide TAAS performance, districts and schools cannot be notified about their comparison group quartile performance in advance of the ratings release date. By 1998, there will be a five year history of providing educators with all of the information needed to determine their accountability ratings in advance. For this reason, it will take a two year performance decline for ratings to be lowered.

Districts and schools which could have a rating changed because of this measure will receive a *Delayed* rating on August 1 because the results of the optional TAAS administration to accommodate year-round calendars are unavailable at that time. Quartile performance cannot be evaluated without complete results. The Texas Education Agency will set the calendar for when this type of *Delayed* rating will be finalized in the *1998 Accountability Manual*, after evaluating several years experience with constructing the measure.

Any changes in the TAAS itself due to the development of essential knowledge and skills (TEKs) may have implications for Comparable Improvement and other components of the public school accountability system.

Examples of Ratings Impact

The application of base indicator standards, Required Improvement, and Comparable Improvement to determine a rating is illustrated with a series of examples. They show hypothetical 1998 and 1999 applications of situations where ratings arechanged, as well as situations where there is no impact.

EXAMPLE 1

Indicator	Base Indicator Std.	Required Improvement	Comparable Improvement	1998 Rating
TAAS Reading	*Recognized*, >=80%	N / A	Q2, declining TAG	
TAAS Mathematics	*Recognized*, >=80%	N / A	Q4, declining TAG	
TAAS Writing	*Recognized*, >=80%	N / A	N / A	*Exemplary*
Dropouts	*Recognized*, <=3.5%	N / A	N / A	
Attendance	yes, >=94%	N / A	N / A	

1999 Rating: *Recognized* with Mathematics Warning

Even with a Q4 Comparable Improvement value and a declining TAG in mathematics in 1998, the rating would not be lowered to *Acceptable* because the school / district had not been warned the previous year. Only *Recognized* schools and districts can receive a warning.

EXAMPLE 2

Indicator	Base Indicator Std.	Required Improvement	Comparable Improvement	1997 Rating
TAAS Reading	*Recognized*, >=80%	N / A	Q2, positive TAG	
TAAS Mathematics	*Acceptable*, 77%	failed	Q1, positive TAG	
TAAS Writing	*Acceptable*, 79%	met	N / A	*Acceptable*
Dropouts	*Recognized*, <=3.5%	N / A	N / A	
Attendance	yes, >=94%	N / A	N / A	

1998 Rating: *Recognized*

This school had performance at the top of the *Acceptable* range. However, because it met Required Improvement for Writing in the student group(s) below 80.0 percent passing, Comparable Improvement in mathematics, and all *Recognized* attendance and dropout rate standards, it will be rated *Recognized*.

EXAMPLE 3

Indicator	Base Indicator Std.	Required Improvement	Comparable Improvement	1997 Rating
TAAS Reading	*Low-performing*, <40%	failed	Q1, positive TAG	
TAAS Mathematics	*Acceptable*, >=40%	N / A	Q2, positive TAG	
TAAS Writing	*Acceptable*, >=40%	N / A	N / A	*Acceptable*
Dropouts	*Low-performing*, >6%	failed	N / A	
Attendance	yes, >=94%	N / A	N / A	

1998 Rating: *Low-performing*

Even though this school met the Comparable Improvement standard which would raise its rating to *Acceptable*, it will still be rated *Low-performing* because it failed Required Improvement for Dropouts.

Table 3 — Application of Comparable Improvement in 1998

Accountability Rating	1998 TAAS Performance for Reading and Math, *(All Students and Each Student Group)*	Reading / Math Improvement Requirements	Comparable Improvement TLI Growth Quartile	1998 TAAS Performance for Writing *(All Students and Each Student Group)*	Writing Improvement Requirements	Dropouts and Attendance Standard Met	Special Notes
Exemplary	>= 90.0%	n / a	n / a	>= 90.0%	n / a	*Exemplary*	none
Recognized	>= 80.0%	none	Q1, Q2, Q3	>= 80.0%	none	*Recognized*	none
			Q4 and Negative Growth (current yr) †				Warning †
	>= 75.0%	CI - R / M **or** RI - R / M	Q1 * and Positive Growth	75.0% - 79.9%	RI		none
Acceptable	75.0% - 79.9%	failed RI & CI	--	75.0% - 79.9%	failed RI	*Acceptable*	none
	40.0% - 74.9%	n / a	n /a	40.0% - 74.9%	n / a		
	< 40.0 for one or more subjects / groups	RI - deficient subject / group **or** CI - deficient subject	*Math:* Q1 * or Q2 * and Positive Growth *Reading:* Q1 * and Positive Growth	>= 40.0% **or** met RI			
Low-performing *Due to Dropouts*	--	--	--	--	--	failed dropout RI	none
Due to TAAS Writing	--	--	--	< 40.0%*	failed RI writing	--	
Due to TAAS Math or Reading	< 40.0 for one or more subjects / groups	failed RI and CI	--	--	--	--	

* The district or campus must minimally exhibit a positive average TLI growth for a rating to be raised, regardless of the quartile position of the district's or campus' performance within the comparison group.

† A district or school which meets all absolute standards for *Recognized* but has Comparable Improvement values in the lowest quartile and a declining TAG for two consecutive years in the same subject will be rated *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable*. The first year, a warning will be issued. 1999 is the first year that ratings could actually be lowered.

Table 4 — Application of Comparable Improvement in 1999

Accountability Rating	1999 TAAS Performance for Reading and Math, *(All Students and Each Student Group)*	Reading / Math Improvement Requirements	Comparable Improvement TLI Growth Quartile	1999 TAAS Performance for Writing *(All Students and Each Student Group)*	Writing Improvement Requirements	Dropouts and Attendance Standard Met	Special Notes
Exemplary	>= 90.0%	n / a	n / a	>= 90.0%	n / a	*Exemplary*	none
Recognized	>= 80.0%	none	Q1, Q2, Q3	>= 80.0%	none	*Recognized*	none
			Q4 and Negative Growth (current yr) †				Warning †
	>= 75.0%	CI - R / M **or** RI - R / M	Q1 * and Positive Growth	75.0% - 79.9%	RI		none
Acceptable	80.0% - 89.9%	none	Q4 and Negative Growth in same subject (current & prior yr) †	>= 80.0%	n / a	*Recognized*	none
	75.0% - 79.9%	failed RI & CI	--	75.0% - 79.9%	failed RI	*Acceptable*	
	45.0% - 74.9%	n / a	n /a	45.0% - 74.9%	n / a		
	< 45.0 for one or more subjects / groups	RI - deficient subject / group **or** CI - deficient subject	*Math:* Q1 * or Q2 * and Positive Growth *Reading:* Q1 * and Positive Growth	>= 45.0% **or** met RI			
Low-performing *Due to Dropouts*	--	--	--	--	--	failed dropout RI	none
Due to TAAS Writing	--	--	--	< 45.0%	failed RI writing	--	
Due to TAAS Math or Reading	< 45.0 for one or more subjects / groups	failed RI and CI	--	--	--	--	

* The district or campus must minimally exhibit a positive average TLI growth for a rating to be raised, regardless of the quartile position of the district's or campus' performance within the comparison group.

† A district or school which meets all absolute standards for *Recognized* but has Comparable Improvement values in the lowest quartile and a declining TAG for two consecutive years in the same subject will be rated *Academically Acceptable / Acceptable*. The first year, a warning will be issued. 1999 is the first year that ratings could actually be lowered.

Accessing Comparable Improvement Information on the Internet

Information Available

Information on Comparable Improvement posted on the Internet includes:

- *1996 Accountability Manual, Part 2: Comparable Improvement, published May 1996;*
- Sample Campus Comparison groups based on 1994-95 characteristics, *posted April 1, 1996*; and
- Campus Comparison Groups based on 1995-96 characteristics, *to be posted by October 1, 1996.*

Internet Access

Information on Comparable Improvement, including this manual and campus comparison groups derived from 1994-95 data, can be accessed on the Internet.

1. Point your World-Wide Web browser to the Texas Education Agency WWW/Gopher Server at **http://www.tea.state.tx.us**
2. Select **Texas Public School Accountability System (Ratings, Standards & Manual)**.
3. Select **1996 Accountability Manual, Part 2: Comparable Improvement**.

TENET Access

If your only access to the Internet is through a dial-up connection to the Texas Education Network (TENET), follow these instructions:

1. From the TENET Main Menu, select **3: Internet Resources**.
2. From the Internet Resources menu, select **12: TENET WWW**, and enter the World-Wide Web using the Lynx browser software. The first page you see will be **Texas Education Network (TENET) Web**.
3. Press the letter **g** and enter **http://www.tea.state.tx.us**
   You will see the page titled **Texas Education Agency — WWW/Gopher Server**.

TENET Access (cont.)

(HINT: To have easy access to the TEA WWW server in the future, add it to your personal bookmarks file by doing the following:

a. Enter the TEA WWW server using instructions 1-3 above.

b. Press the letter **a**. You will see the following prompt:

Save **D**)ocument or **L**)ink to bookmark file or **C**)ancel? (d,l,c):

c. Press the letter **d**. It will reply "Done!", indicating that the TEA WWW server has been added to your list of bookmarks.

d. To access the TEA WWW server in the future, enter Lynx by following instructions 1 and 2 above. Then press the letter **v** to view your bookmarks. Select the **Texas Education Agency** bookmark.)

4. Select **Texas Public School Accountability System (Ratings, Standards & Manual)**.
5. Select **1996 Accountability Manual, Part 2: Comparable Improvement**.

Questions

If you have problems, please call (512) 463-9701.

Texas Education Agency
GE6 602 03

BEST COPY AVAILABLE